

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 20, 2008.

Claims 1-15 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 12 have been amended.

Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Favorable review is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a first user interface displaying a graphical illustration of activities and/or documents required to complete the sales transaction, an estimated due date pertaining to each of said activities and/or documents, an actual completion date pertaining to each of said activities and/or documents, and closing information including an estimated closing date, closing location and summary of disbursements. Support for these added claim features is found in the specification at least at paragraph 47, with reference to FIGS. 15A and 15B. In the embodiment described in the specification, the system provides a tracking functionality for monitoring transaction deadlines ("Countdown to Closing") which includes tracking estimated and actual dates for completing various items and includes closing information.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite a second user interface providing access to data regarding the object, the data including a government registration number for the object and manufacturer's data for the object. Support for these added claim features is found in the specification at least at paragraph 35, with reference to FIGS. 4A and 4B. In the embodiment described in the specification, the system includes a user interface providing details regarding the object ("Vessel Detail").

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite an additional user interface (fifth user interface) providing access to the documents by a user performing at least one of a government registration service and a mortgage perfection service for the object. Support for these added claim features is found in the specification at least at paragraphs 25 and 44, with reference to FIGS. 27A and 27B. In the embodiment described in the specification, the system includes a user interface for entering and reviewing information relative to Federal vessel documentation ("Documentation Checklist"); this information is used by a Documentation Agent user of the system.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite a notification engine for providing messages to the parties of the sales transaction corresponding to the activities and documents of the transaction; these messages include an advanced notification regarding a warranty registration

provided to a manufacturer of the object. Support for these added claim features is found in the specification at least at paragraph 51. In the embodiment described in the specification, the system triggers distribution of advance notification for boat warranty registration ("Warranty Trigger"). Claim 12 has been similarly amended to recite a controller including a notification engine for providing an advanced notification regarding a warranty registration provided to a manufacturer of the object.

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the object of value is comprised of one of a yacht, boat, ship, marine vessel, aircraft, motor vehicle, and other transportation vehicles for personal, commercial and/or recreational use. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mini et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,684,196). Claim 6, dependent from claim 1, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mini et al. in view of Raveis (US2002/0049624). The applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a system that tracks and monitors the activities related to a sales transaction for an object of value. Claim 1 has been amended to recite several features that apply to objects (e.g. marine vessels) but are not pertinent to sales transactions for real estate. Mini et al. is understood to disclose a system for online automation of real estate transactions. The recited features of claim 1, described above, are neither taught nor suggested in Mini et al. In particular, the system of claim 1 provides a first user interface displaying an estimated due date pertaining to each of several activities and/or documents, an actual completion date pertaining to each activity and/or document, and closing information including an estimated closing date, closing location and summary of disbursements. The Examiner points to Mini et al., col. 3, lines 54-57, and FIGS. 6 and 22, for a disclosure of these features. This disclosure in Mini et al. merely states that parties may check on the status of the transaction at any time, and does not suggest any capability to display estimated or actual dates for closing or other activities. Furthermore, Mini et al. offers no teaching or suggestion regarding details of closing information via this interface (e.g. closing location and summary of disbursements), as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites a second user interface providing access to data regarding the object, the data including a government registration number for the object and manufacturer's data for

the object. Mini et al. offers no teaching or suggestion regarding this feature, since it is not pertinent to a real estate transaction.

Similarly, claim 1 recites a notification engine for providing messages to the parties of the sales transaction corresponding to the activities and documents of the transaction, the messages including an advanced notification regarding a warranty registration provided to a manufacturer of the object. This claim feature specifically refers to a notification to a manufacturer of an object, and thus clearly is not pertinent to a real estate transaction. Accordingly, this feature of amended claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested in Mini et al. The Raveis publication is understood (paragraph 160 and FIG. 11) to disclose a page where a user (e.g. a sales agent) may make 'notes' after selecting a 'notes icon.' The 'notes' of Raveis apparently remain on that page, and are not sent as messages to anyone. In particular, Raveis does not suggest sending advanced notification regarding warranty registration. One following the teaching of Raveis would not be motivated to send such notification, since Raveis is concerned with transactions in real estate as opposed to a manufactured object.

It is respectfully submitted that Mini et al. does not suggest the above-noted features of amended claim 1, and that Raveis does not remedy the defects of Mini et al. as a reference against claim 1. Claim 1 thus is not rendered obvious by either Mini et al. or Raveis, or by a combination thereof.

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mini et al. in view of Rose (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,064). The applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 12 is patentable over the cited art, for the following reasons.

Claim 12, as amended, recites a notification engine for providing an advanced notification regarding a warranty registration provided to a manufacturer of the object. As noted above, Mini et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature, and indeed does not offer any suggestion regarding a warranty for an object which is involved in a sales transaction. Rose is not at all concerned with real estate transactions. Rose is concerned with tracking the title of objects, and does not suggest any advanced message to a manufacturer regarding warranty registration. The only mention Rose makes of a warranty for an object (col. 11, line 10) is in the context of an insurance company receiving a copy of the title. Rose thus does not suggest the above-noted feature of claim 12.

Even if one might be motivated to combine the real estate tracking of Mini et al. with Rose (a point not conceded), this feature of amended claim 12 would not be obvious from that combination.

The other claims in the application are dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is deemed to recite a separate aspect of the invention, however, the consideration of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay H. Anderson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 38,371

Date: January 14, 2009

CONTACT INFORMATION:

WIGGIN & DANA LLP
One Century Tower
New Haven, CT 06508-1832

Telephone: (212) 551-2625
Facsimile: (212) 490-0536
Email: janderson@wiggin.com

15767\1\2161075.2